

Globalization, Justice and Philosophy

Joseph B. R. Gaie*

There are many issues that can be raised or that arise from the above title. In this paper I want to argue that: 1. Globalization, justice and philosophy are definitely related. 2. Globalization may be good for all stakeholders. 3. Globalization is good for all stakeholders only if it is consistent with justice. 4. Moral, rather than legal, justice helps us tie globalization to philosophy even though it can be related to other areas of philosophy. To begin the debate I will start with working definitions of our terms “globalization”, “justice”, “philosophy”.

Globalization

Presumably the term “globalization” derives from the word “globe”, which refers to the planet Earth. It means what we can refer to as “universalization”, which is, making something universal. It is inclusiveness. In mathematical terms, we can talk of a universal set; meaning that it is the main or biggest possible set to which all the members belong. A universal set would be the biggest set of which others are sub-sets or sections. To globalize or universalize something means it is made to apply in the universal set or in all cases. If we take different the people of countries, regions and continents as sub-sets, the universal set would be the whole of humanity. If we are talking about the law, a universalized law would be one which applied in all countries of the world. A universalized culture would be one that applied to, or was practised by, the whole world.

Joseph B. R. Gaie is Senior Lecturer in Philosophy and Head of Department of Theology and Religious Studies, University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana. He was a Research Scholar at Johns Hopkins University in 2010.

One such culture is evident in football, where FIFA is the law-giver who rules world football. The law on penalties in football, for example, is universal.

Universalization in philosophy, especially in ethics, simply means that a principle is applicable to everybody in similar circumstances (Mackie, 1977: 83ff; Boylan, 2000: 94ff). For example, if I expect people to respect me, I must accept that other people like me must be respected or minimally, that they will also wish to be respected. Respect for me, the individual, is reciprocally universalized to apply to all things that are significantly like me. In fact Alan Gewirth (2000: 489-494) has argued that the interest and well-being of an individual is the basis of a moral right that is universalizable, meaning it must be applied globally to all members of the human race.

Kwasi Wiredu (1996: 21ff) tackles the question of whether cultural universals exist. By that he meant to determine whether it was possible to come up with something about any culture that applies to the global human community. He does identify communication as such a thing. Human beings communicate and it is a fact that applies in the whole world.

A. Payne (2004: 3) describes globalization as “a phenomenon which, it should be said, many have found easier to applaud or condemn than analyse and understand.” The context of globalization today is the view about unifying different aspects of peoples of the world. Globalization can be cultural, technological, financial, economic, political, social and so forth. It is defined as “the process of creating a common economic space which leads to a growing integration of the world economy through increasingly free movement of goods, capital, and labor” (Lal, 2004: XIX).

The term ‘globalization’ arose as a result of some analysts thinking that the hegemonic influence of the U.S.A. had faded in the 1970s and what was critical in the world economy was the international elites, who ran big multinational companies. This gave rise to a lot of academic analysis of the world economy, leading to the term being “simultaneously overused and underdefined” (Payne, 2004: 28). It is a social process that is public and private, political and non-political. It collapses local/domestic, internal, national and regional affairs into global ones. “Globalization may be thought of initially as the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life, from the cultural to the criminal, the financial to the spiritual” (Payne, 2004: 29). So, we can say that globalization is the process of breaking borders between countries and regions to create one big village. Some people actually refer to it as the villagization of the planet Earth. Having given a working definition of “globalization”, we can now go on to look at justice.

Justice

The issue of justice has been debated in philosophy for millennia and it has remained an elusive concept to define, while putative definitions have proven to be divisive. Michael Boylan (2001), following Rawls (1971), describes justice as fairness. Fairness includes sometimes treating people in the same way and sometimes differently. He gives the example that if everyone in a family loves chocolate cake equally and, other things being equal, the just way to divide a chocolate cake in the family is to give each member an equal share (Boylan, 2001: 264). Judith J. Thomson (2001) and R. Simon (2001) have discussed the issue of preferential hiring as something that could be

demanded by justice. Here the argument was whether or not it is fair or just to hire people on the basis of certain criteria, such as gender (in the case of women), or race (in the case of blacks), because it would be like giving back to them what they have lost on account of the treatment they got because of their statuses in previous social dispensations. Justice is balancing the scales, where each person has access to what they have the right to without impediment.

In the Setswana tradition the word justice is not easily translatable. The word *tshiamo* can sometimes be given as a translation of this word, even though it is not accurate, because it can also mean goodness. The more appropriate word is *botho*, which not only encapsulates the essence of justice but also reflects more than what the word justice means in English. I have advanced an argument for the appropriation of the word in both metaphysical and ethical perspectives (Gaie, 2007). The word simply means “human-being-hood”. An agent that has human-being-hood will not only treat others fairly and justly, but also would not want to reap where they did not sow. They would not only wish for the presence of justice, but they will also try to do away with injustice whenever it is present and whenever they can.

It also means that an individual is able to see their place in the community. They are concerned about the well being of others and realise their fulfilment in and through the fulfilment of others. Justice or *botho* would not accept a situation in which somebody suffers because they have no means. Mogobe Ramose (2002) has described *botho* as encapsulated in the Setswana saying *feta kgomo o tshware motho*, meaning “you as a person can pass a cow and hold a person”. Its variation is *ga le fete kgomo le thaba motho*, meaning “a spear does not pass a cow and stab a person”, which is explained to

mean that it is more important to save a person than to preserve riches. We will talk more about this below.

For Plato, justice is at two levels – in the individual and in society. An individual is in a state of equilibrium when the different parts of their humanity are in harmony with each other, working together for the benefit of the person. This is possible when the different parts of the human being do their individual duties, without getting into the way of the others. For example as a rational animal, a human being must act when reason has deliberated and influenced the will to be drawn towards the reasonable thing and the emotions have also come along as per the dictates of reason. A person who acts from emotions and reasons afterwards is usually in trouble, because they are not behaving *qua* rational being but *qua* emotional being, which is not their nature, hence misbalance/disequilibrium that he calls injustice.

Likewise in society every person has a role to play, for the benefit of themselves and society at large. Disequilibrium will result when the different members of society get in each other's way; when leaders steal and rule based on their selfish whims and workers abandon their posts in pursuit of pleasure, and when they value and reward behaviours that have no value to society there would be chaos; which leads to unfair treatment of other members of society and indeed, everybody. Justice is when rulers do what is good for the state and lead the country to a life of fair livelihood.

The theme of justice is also found in Immanuel Kant, who starts by cautioning that the question 'what is justice?'

Can be just as perplexing for a jurist as the well-known question "What is truth?" is for a logician, assuming, that is, that he does not want to lapse into a mere tautology or to refer us to the laws of a particular country at a particular time. A jurist can, of course, tell us what the actual Law of the land is (*quid sit juris*), that

is, what the laws say or have said at a certain time and at a certain place. But whether what these laws prescribe is also just and the universal criterion that will in general enable us to recognise what is just or unjust (*justum et injustum*) – the answer to such questions will remain hidden from him unless, for a while, he abandons empirical principles and searches for the sources of these judgments in pure reason (Kant, 1965: 33-34).

He goes on to explain that, in relation to obligations, justice is about the relationship of people's actions as they affect each other; people's wills in relation to each other and lastly, the relationship of the two wills as autonomous and accommodative of each other in accordance with a universal law. He concludes, "justice is therefore the aggregate of those conditions under which the will of one person can be conjoined with the will of another in accordance with a universal law of freedom" (Kant, 1965: 34). Justice is a universal principle, according to him. "Every action," he argues, "is just [right] that in itself or in its maxim is such that the freedom of the will of each can coexist together with the freedom of everyone in accordance with a universal law" (Kant, 1965: 35). What he means is that every individual has the freedom to act in their own interest and they should be willing to grant that all other free beings like them have the same right. So the agent acts justly when they act in such a way that they will to have their action to be consistent with the autonomous wills of other people. Because every person has an equal right to free will, justice demands that each person should be accorded the same. I am free to bind you to what you can bind me to and vice versa. What we are each bound to can and should never be something we are unable to attain. We shall return to Immanuel Kant when we deal with the issue of globalization as applied in our society. Let us now turn to the definition of philosophy.

Philosophy

The word ‘philosophy’ is a compound of two Greek words ‘philos’ (φίλος) and ‘sophos’ (σοφός). The former means ‘friend’ and the latter means ‘wise man’. A person is beloved of their friend, and that is where we get the word ‘phileo’ (φιλέω), which means ‘I love.’ A wise person is one who has sophia (σοφία), which is wisdom. So philosophy is the friendship with wisdom or the love of wisdom. As a discipline, it is the study of wisdom. Now wisdom is so pregnant with meaning that it would take us out of the scope of this paper to analyse it. What I can say, in short, is that being wise involves having certain characteristics some of which are the ability to analyse, synthesise, question, inquire, relate; to be critical, coherent, comprehensive, consistent, honest and to be passionate about the truth. It involves introspective examination of both the individual self and the community (Bewaji 2003: 30-31). When we analyse society in particular, and the universe, in general, we are involved in philosophising in different spheres or branches of philosophy. In society, for example, we can examine the meaning of our language, including the word ‘globalization’ or ‘universalization’; thereby being engaged in the philosophy of language. This will become clearer later on when we relate philosophy to globalization and justice, which I will start doing in the next section.

The good globalization

Some views about globalization are reflected by statements such as “elementary economics tells us that this process is a potentially mutually beneficial process” (Lal, 2004: XIX). It appears to be a clear and uncontroversial claim that the oxygen, water, carbons, including the dioxide and nitrogen, etc. belong to every inhabitant of the planet Earth, and nobody should lay more claims to them than others. It, however, becomes a bit confused and not that uncontroversial the moment one talks about the land and seas

which some people have arrogated to themselves. It is, however, clear that the planet belongs to all of us and as members of the same human and earthly inhabitants' family, we should be in touch with each other in different and various ways, in order to enhance our being, regarding bonding and growth, among other things. That is what globalization, or what we may call the "universalization" of human dignity, ought to be about. This globalization of human dignity, or the liberation of rights attributable to all and sundry, has various aspects according to the way we view society. Thus, there are, among others, political, educational, social, cultural, scientific, ethical, religious and economic aspects of globalization. We can note that even thieves and other criminals have gone global -they have networked beyond national and regional borders.

What we should be concerned about at this point is the positive aspect of globalization. There are some positive results from globalization, if it is done in a certain way. For example, globalization has made it possible for people to transcend borders and benefit in ways that would have been difficult if there was no globalization. Here we are thinking of things like the linkage of the world through the internet. People can easily share information and there is a lot of useful information which people can now access, irrespective of where they are, with the exception, of course, of communities that do not have electricity as well as internet connectivity. Scholars now can be informed about conferences and other academic processes going on in different places. They can send their papers through the internet and email many places that they could otherwise not reach if it were not for the globalization phenomenon.

People can now do some courses on-line and they do not need to go through the hassles they would normally go through without globalization. This also opens up opportunities for employment, which people can learn about and respond to on line.

One of the other areas that show the positive sides of globalization is cultural exchange, in the sense that now people are able to appreciate the cultural practices of the others more, as they are now exposed to them more than ever before. This creates the potential for people to understand each other and to appreciate others' perspectives from an informed position, rather than stereotypical attitudes that commonly get fuelled by ignorance. For example, through television and other media people from different cultures are able to know that in Africa there are good roads and habitable houses just as much as we have poverty, disease and political turmoil in some cases, as in other parts of the world. People do not only appreciate the beauty of the African continent, but they are also offered an opportunity to converse with some of our brilliant minds, and appreciate the best among all that this planet has offered.

In the area of economics it has been argued that globalization, which is equated with global capitalism, has improved the lives of many people through poverty reduction. Bhalla is said to have found that people living on US\$1 a day have been reduced from 30% in 1987 to 13.1% in 2000, where globalization has taken place. Contrast this with Africa, which has not globalized and also faces serious governance problems, and as such is about the only place that has seen an increase in poverty. "Contrary to Stiglitz, the World Bank, and the anti-globalization brigade, in the latest period which really began with the 1980s, there has been a historically unprecedented decline in Third World poverty" (Lal, 2004: 123).

From an African point of view, economic globalization is good when it improves the lives of the people. Taking the Botswana traditional thought system as an example, economic empowerment was long grafted into the national agenda, only to be disengaged during the colonization period and finally mutilated when Africans adopted the individualistic perspectives of the West. The Botswana tradition had a loan system whereby a poor man could be given a team of oxen, to plough and some cows to raise and look after, by a well-off neighbour. The poor man would get a periodical visit from the owner of the cattle who usually gave him one or more heifers every year when he comes to inspect his livestock. In five to ten years time the poor man would have his own cattle, which would enable him to plough, produce milk and generally become well-off. It is in this sense that globalization is meaningful - when the rich northern part of the planet earth empowers the poor south.

In the Botswana traditional case we can see the true globalization of riches. The well-off were not only asking to be served by the poor, but were also empowering them. The African thinks that it is not good for me, as an individual, to be the only one who drives a Mercedes Benz, because when I have a puncture in the village I will not be able to borrow a spare wheel. Thus, economic empowerment is not just helping other people who have nothing, but it is also helping the very person who offers the help.

From the above perspective, globalization is the realization of the fact that we, as members of the human family, are one and belong to each other. It is therefore in order for us to share of ourselves in different ways. This sharing calls for the acknowledgement that even though we are different in various ways and for a plethora of reasons, our uniqueness as individuals, communities, countries and regional blocks

uniquely contribute to this coat of many colours that we call humanity. Our individual contributions to the global reality add to the beauty of the rainbow that we call human life and therefore none of us can claim to belong more or less than others. Globalization, in this way, becomes a communion whereby people recognize, acknowledge, appreciate and are conscious of others' presence and equality in this consciousness. It would be a process of self-awareness of the species and the whole of planet earth.

Consistency of Globalisation with Justice

From the above definition of justice we should be able to say that what I have just described in the above section is something that is not only consistent with justice but also what justice demands. In other words, the Africans are right in seeing themselves and each other as belonging together – which is cemented in the concept of *botho* in Setswana and *ubuntu* in Zulu, IsiNdebele and Xhosa (Ramose 2002, 2003 and Bewaji 2003). It is this concept of humanity among Africans, where “I am, because we are”; the idea that not only is the individual important in themselves, but they are also important as a microcosm of the society. The society or my community sees me as its own embodiment or individuation – I am not simply an isolated, isolatable and individuated thing, standing alone and having to face life on my own (Bewaji 2009). I am the particularization of the community; or if you like, the community concretized and identified, as well as identifying.

This is consistent with justice, if by that we mean the proper, equitable, fair and empathetic allocation of resources to all stakeholders. This means, as far as one is concerned, there is nothing that can happen to me that society and my community has no interest in; for any injustice meted out to me is likewise done to the community. This is

so clearly the case that to offer an argument as a demonstration is almost insane, within the African socio-cultural context. This is easily demonstrable with the example of sports. A particular athlete succeeds and the nation from which he comes also succeeds. Magic Johnson did not only become famous and successful just for himself; he is the epitome of his club's and American greatness in basketball.

It is therefore rational to see the communitarian society as representing a just society. In this scheme, it does not make sense to make a comparison between the individual and community – to say that one could be better than the other or must be more primary than the other. The question is simply an oxymoron. This is because the two are different aspects of the same thing. They are inseparable. So justice is treating alike cases alike, when the situation demands, and allocating everything the proper weight. The spirit of *botho* is captured thus by The Presidential Task Group for a Long Term Vision for Botswana:

“Botho” defines a process for earning respect by first giving it, and to gain empowerment by empowering others. It encourages people to applaud rather than resent those who succeed. It disapproves of anti-social, disgraceful, inhuman and criminal behaviour, and, moreover, encourages social justice for all. “Botho” as a concept must stretch to its utmost limits the largeness of the spirit of all Batswana. It must permeate every aspect of our lives, like the air we breathe, so that no Motswana will rest easy knowing that another is in need (Gaie, 2005: 59).

In order to adequately demonstrate the above, we have to look in more detail, at the relevance of moral justice, rather than legal justice, to globalization. We will look at how different philosophies are relevant to this globalization. A sample of issues in epistemology, ethics and culture will be enough to demonstrate the importance and primacy of moral over legal justice in relation to globalization.

Moral Justice and the Relevance of Philosophy to Globalization

In this section I am arguing that moral justice is important in making philosophy relevant to globalization. In short there should not be any globalization if there is no justice. Justice demands that globalization be carried out justly; that is, fairly without any violation of moral rights.

Justice is different from legality, even though the latter sometimes is necessary for the former to take root (Hart 1978). However, it is clear that laws at local, regional and global levels can be used to circumvent justice as well as to promote it. The major problem with globalization is the possibility of those who are powerful to enact laws that favour them. They would then do things that are legal and yet unjust. The United Nations Organization, for example, can be used by powerful members to do things that are not good for some communities even though they are legal under the organization's regulations and laws. This is very clear in the case of trade.

Prasad, et al. (2003: 2) argue that financial globalization increased the flow of funds across countries, thereby creating linkages that go to capital markets of the world. This would potentially be good for the people, as they may have access to funds, including additional international funds for their countries. They however point out that, "while there is no proof that in the data that financial globalization has benefited growth, there is evidence that some countries may have experienced greater consumption volatility as a result" (2003: 1). The data that they are referring to here is the information that they collected to find out how financial globalization has impacted upon developing economies. They found that the available literature made a causal link between national economic development and globalization. But they concluded that:

the majority, however, find either no effect or, at best, a mixed effect. Thus, an objective reading of the results of the vast research effort undertaken to date

suggests that there is no strong, robust, and uniform support for the theoretical argument that financial globalization per se delivers a higher rate of economic growth (Prasad et. al., 2003:3).

R. Went (2000:2) has pointed out that globalization has been abused. Governments of the third world countries are not able to operate, because they are under restrictions exerted by the IMF, World Bank, WTO, OECD and the G8.

It is demanded that they globalise, technologise, drive competitors out of business (monopolise) or face the same, liberalise the national market, should not have any state intervention in the economy, privatise (p. 2).

Any government that does not obey these directives faces dire consequences, such as paying high interest rates on their loans and being denied access to capital. When nation states try to protect their fledgling companies they face international sanctions and the multinational companies can simply decide to pull their investments out of the said countries.

Increased concentration of capital has put excessive, in fact uncontrollable power in the hands of a small group. A few hundred of the world's largest industrial firms control trillions of dollars worth of productive activity. These companies' veto can be enough to hold up all sorts of important political decisions. Financial markets have become the world economy's judge, jury and policeman (Went, 2000: 3). National governments themselves have become paralyzed and they can take measures that are not palatable for their citizenry in order to honour the requirements of some agreement with an international body, such as the SADC or Maastricht Treaty. "Globalization becomes, in this way, an alibi for lack of political imagination, cowardice, social anorexia and anti-social policies" (Went, 2000: 3-4).

Countries can be ruined economically because some big multinational companies do not like the government. A very vivid example is Palestine which had a

democratically elected government that the West did not like. Israel blockaded the country with the support of the West and all the funding was stopped. The Palestinian territory was in a state of war until 2007 when the government co-opted the party that appeared to be acceptable to the West. Israel on the other hand has enjoyed the support of the West, in spite of the many occasions that it did not yield to international law, including numerous United Nations resolutions.

There are many international mergers of companies resulting in more use of technology-based instruments that change the face of assembly lines that produce goods without the benefits going to the workers or local small businesses. High profits and lower production costs usually come at the cost of employee wages and job cuts. In short, the profits of globalization are not necessarily for the benefit of the poor – both as individuals and as nation states.

The so-called developed countries are protectionist when it comes to their national economies and companies. For example, the United States and Western Europe are distorting the agricultural market by subsidizing their farmers. Even amongst themselves they are routing for narrow nationalist interests. For example, the major reason why the British are not using the Euro is because they have been arguing that it is not in their national interest – thus, whatever is not in their national interest must give way even if it is in the interest of the European Union.

There are trade wars and conflicts of interest in the developed world. Reports, such as:

Clinton threatens the Japanese with sanctions unless Japan admits more US cars; Boeing wages battle with a European consortium in order to get its foot in the door of China's market for a new generation of aircraft; [...] since the end of the

Cold War the CIA is devoting a great part of its budget to economic espionage (Went, 2000: 25), are increasingly common. This reflects a globalization that is near a Hobbesian state of nature, where all are at war against all (Price, 2000: 168ff). Globalization of this mode is not good because, for example:

... some developing countries would even be harmed by the GATT treaty. An UNCTAD study came to the conclusion that, as a result of the Uruguay Round, the world's 48 poorest countries would lose \$300 to \$600 million a year in decreased export and increased food imports (Went, 2000: 26).

One other evil brought about by globalization is the faith in privatization, whereby public institutions have to be auctioned off to the highest bidders, who in many cases do not pay the due rate for it. The companies can then decide to reduce or increase the workforce, increase or reduce production, depending on whether they will get the maximum profit. Went (2000: 28-29) gives the example of a British company (Morgan Crucible), which reduced production in France, Holland and Belgium where laws were more favourable to employees, and increased production in China, Vietnam and Czech Republic where laws were unfavourable to employees. For example, they would pay an employee in these countries \$1 per day when they could pay \$31 in Japan. In poor countries, companies can just threaten to shut down production to force workers to accept slave wages, whilst they themselves make huge profits.

Globalization has also increased migration of millions of poor people who get exploited in the industrialized countries. Mexicans and people from other nations are exploited in the United States. They are illegal aliens who work for slave wages and can be dispensed with without any hassle. Of course this situation is experienced in developing countries, where one country is worse off economically than its neighbour. Zimbabweans, for example, are exploited in Botswana and South Africa, because their

country has been ruined partly by the racist policies of the International Monetary Fund and also by the tyrannical regime of Robert Mugabe.

The sex trade, now referred to as sex tourism, has increased or is on the increase, according to Went (2000: 38). This, of course, comes along with other problems, such as disease and the break down of social control, which is related to crime and socio-political instability.

One of the major negative issues of globalization is the fact that resources of the planet are not shared equally. The big spenders and consumers, especially United States of America, cause global warming for everyone and when the undesirable consequences arise they want the poor countries to share the burden. Toxic industrial waste has been dumped in many poor countries. For example Guinea-Bissau accepted toxic waste and got \$600 million which the country needed badly to balance its own accounts.

Recently there has been a shortage of organ transplants because the affluent members of the industrial world are doing things that negatively affect health. Still the rich people from the West go to China and buy organs. They go to other developing countries and recruit organ donors in exchange for money. The World Health Organization was concerned about this state of affairs whereby “transplant tourism” was growing, whereby organs were transported across borders at the risk of live donors. It has become big business. The WHO is going to assist in coming up with a “Global Forum on Transplantation”, so that transplants can be more equitable with a uniform approach to organ transplantation (people to people). It is clear again in this case that the concern is about the West. If less people were affected there and the phenomenon were say in Africa more than anywhere, most probably this initiative would not have taken

place. It seems to be nothing more than an attempt to legally misappropriate the developing world's resources again.

The industrial West is currently experiencing shortages in medical personnel. It has now embarked upon a campaign to price away medical personnel from the developing world. We find nurses, doctors and other important medical personnel being recruited to work in the West. The poor countries where these personnel originate are not in a position to match the salaries offered by the rich north. The devastation of malaria, HIV/AIDS inevitably follow in places like Africa.

This, of course, is not a new phenomenon, as a lot of brain drain has been going on from Africa and other third world societies to the Western world – the best professors in many academic fields have been transplanted to the West leaving their countries barren, without good academic leadership.

The above account shows the unjust nature of globalization as practised today. My argument is that even though in many cases the West can point to the fact that they are not violating any international treaty or law, they are, all the same, behaving unjustly. It is the task of Ethics to show not only that such injustice is immoral but also to agitate for change in the positive direction.

In the case of culture, for example, globalization does not seem to mean the inclusion of all cultures in the global village that we call planet earth. It is the Europeanization or Americanization of the world, depending on which empire monopolizes the instruments of violence more than others. Musa Dube (2006:182) explains that “religion's resistance to globalization is also inevitable, for globalization entails cultural imperialism - through selling the religions and cultures of globalizing

powers.” She goes on to ask serious questions about the phenomenon of globalization and says that she sees why it is sensible from a religious point of view, since the story of creation is a form of globalization which is acceptable to her (Dube, 2006:186). One of the major questions she asks is the ethical nature of the phenomenon. She concludes by re-emphasising the important questions that need to be asked by religious people – the participation of religion in an ethically globalizing way, while secondly resisting patriarchal dominance.

This is instructive, in that Dube is a Christian scholar. In my view, to be a Christian is to be swallowed in a global movement called Christianity, that is, if one is an African or from the Caribbean. We Africans have left our religions and accepted the globalizing one of Christianity. The same can be said about Islam. African Traditional Religions are known for their syncretistic nature. That is, they are open to other influences. Christianity is not like that. It is a conquering religion just like Islam and others. These religions see themselves as the only true faiths. Pope Benedict XIV (Zenit 70330) recently cautioned about the dangers of syncretism. He explained that globalization demanded a dialogue between religions and cultures and yet he wanted the religious to steer clear of syncretism. He is prepared to have the cultures and religions working in their own different spheres for the common good. This creates a problem for those who want to rationalize about the idea that a religion can see itself as the unique truth and yet respect others. If I am telling the truth it is difficult to accord the other party the respect that I want regarding this truth, because their’s is untruth and therefore does not deserve a seat in the cathedral of truth. It is the thinking of Christians that even though some cultures can assimilate some Christian traits, Christianity itself needs to be

wary of absorbing other cultures – if they absorb too much they would be syncretistic. It is only recently that the church realised the importance of local cultures. That is when it began talking enculturation – it is a form of baptizing local cultures into Christianity, not the other way round.

This cultural imperialism is evident again when Christians want Africans, for example, to accept their ways of life when they do not want to accept the Africans' ways of life. One example is homosexuality which the West seems to accept as normal human behaviour, which some even want to say is Christian. If we look at the Anglican Church and others from the West, for example, they have totally rejected polygamy (both polygyny and polyandry) because it is typically African, but they are willing to accept homosexuality (confer on it the euphemistic hullabaloo glorification about same-sex marriages, homosexual priests and bishops, while very little is said about polygamy).

The Beijing Conference of 1995 bears testimony to the globalizing forces as dictating culture and morality. Lal (2004: xviii) reports that:

One night the ambassador was woken by an agitated Chinese official, asking him to rush to the tent city as the Indian delegates were rioting. On getting there he found that the trouble began when some American delegates went into the tents of their Third World sisters and tried to initiate them into the joys of gay sex. With the Indians in the lead, the Third World women chased the American women out of their tents, beating them with their slippers. This attempt to convert their Eastern sisters to their Western sexual mores obviously failed. But what would be the consequences if the new American imperium was to become a new international moral order, aiming to legislate its particular "habits of the heart" around the world?

He goes on to say that morality is actually related to the empire. It is the one that determines right and wrong. This is important for philosophy, in that we are able to analyse the situation and realise that the Western attitude to African culture reflects a murder of African epistemology, ethics and metaphysics. Truth is not truth if not stated

by the powerful. This goes on to ethics as well. Whatever the master says is morally wrong is morally wrong. The task of philosophy is to analyse the nature of truth, morality and justice. When it is found in the West we should be able to say it is present in African and other cultures, if it smells like what is in the west. If we are equal as human beings and our rationality is not removed by our geographical location, then we must be able to say that some of the globalizing attempts are not consistent with reason, if they are meant to be moral.

King Moshoeshoe II of Lesotho cautioned that the loss of the African way of life has had dire consequences for the continent. He says:

The loss of such a way of life, and with it, of cultural identity, lies at the root of African underdevelopment and of the current African crisis – political instability, social and economic decline, poor governance, extensive corruption of power and privilege, and much else.

When a people lose their identity, they also lose their capacity for self-development, self-reliance, and self-determination. Society begins to disintegrate, and self-respect is replaced by alienation. Such is the experience of African culture in the face of colonization and neo-colonialism (Moshoeshoe, 2000:528).

The King explains that, in Africa, there was a sacred cord or link between the individual, community, land and the entire environment. This bond is expressed religiously and determines the morality of the society. He goes on:

This sacred bond is only one aspect of African religion, which underpins all African thought and action and which is expressed in an ongoing and unending process of *divine creativity* (emphasis mine) – not only through nature but through each human being. In such a continuum, the individual is seen as a replica of the external universe, which is why it makes sense for each being to always seek harmony with the physical laws of the natural environment (Moshoeshoe, 2000: 530).

What the king is saying here is that African cultural thinking has a certain way of looking at reality. In fact, reality is seen *holistically* (meaning, as a whole), rather than

fragmentally. It means the environment; ethics, justice, epistemology, aesthetics, religion and cosmology are seen as elements of a whole, rather than independent things. From this point of view, globalisation of philosophy would involve the discourse and dialogue about *botho/ubuntu* at a global level. Philosophical issues such as arise in domains of aesthetics and epistemology (Bewaji, 2003, 2007) have to be taken seriously from an African perspective, if we want a truly global philosophy that is anchored on justice.

Conclusion

From the above, we can conclude that globalization, philosophy and justice are related. There are possible mutual benefits from globalization for all concerned. Justice demands that globalization be pursued for the benefit of all, rather than being used as a tool to perpetuate the hegemony of the strong North. Justice seen from a moral point of view, rather than a legal, one is based on ethics of human action. The moral philosophical view of justice does call for certain behaviours, some of which are attested to in the many indigenous philosophies of Africa; which have to be taken seriously at a global level, as competent and useful tools of philosophizing and understanding globalisation.

References

- Bewaji, J.A. I. (2003) *Beauty and Culture—Perspectives in Black Aesthetics*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Ltd.
- (2007) *An Introduction to the Theory of Knowledge. A Pluricultural Approach*. Ibadan: Hope Publications.
- (2009a) “African Aesthetics” (A – 29) in *A Companion to Aesthetics*. 2nd Edition. Eds. Stephen Davies, Kathleen Higgins, Robert Hopkins, Robert Stecker and David Cooper. UK, Colchester: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.. Pp. 139-142.
- (2009b). “The geographies of reason - remapping the existential model across cultural boundaries” in *Caribbean Journal of Philosophy*. Issue 1 Vol 1, <http://ojs.mona.uwi.edu/index.php/cjp/article/viewFile/286/186>.

- (2008). "Philosophy, Cultures and Errors of Ontogenesis – Challenges, Opportunities and Dangers" in Roxanne Burton, Ed Brandon and F. O. Odhiambo, eds. *Conversations in Philosophy – Crossing the Boundaries*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. Pp. 198-212.
 - (2006a) "Human Rights: a Philosophical Analysis of Yoruba Conceptions" in *The Cambrian Law Review*. Vol. 37., pp. 49-72.
 - "World Religions and the new African Union - A Critical Interrogation or A Prolegomenon to an Economics of Religion" in *Scriptura – International Journal of Bible, Religion and Theology in Southern Africa*. Vol. 2. 2006b. pp. 145-166.
 - (2003a) "Philosophical Exploration of Leadership in Caribbean and Diaspora Politics", in *Journal on African Philosophy*. An Electronic Journal of the International Society for African Philosophy and Studies, (ISAPS). <http://www.africanphilosophy.com/issue2/bewaji.html>.
 - (2003b). "If my people must go, they will have to find their way by themselves – Critical comments on Wim Van Binsbergen's *Ubuntu and the Globalisation of Southern African Thought and Society*" in *South African Journal of Philosophy*. Volume 22, No 4, pp. 378-287.
 - (2003c). "Beyond ethno-philosophical myopia – Critical comments on Mogobe B. Ramose's *African Philosophy Through Ubuntu*" in *South African Journal of Philosophy*. Volume 22, No 4, pp. 388-401
- Boylan, M. (2001) "The Future of Affirmative Action" in Boylan, M. (ed.) *Business Ethics*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Pp. 256-270.
- Cook, D "India's cheap drugs under patent threat" in the BBC News http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/2/hi/south_asia/6358721.stm Published: 2007/02/15 11:11:45 GMT
- Dube, M.W. (2006) "Looking back and forward: Postcolonialism, Globalization, God and Gender" in *Scriptura* **92 (2006:2)**, pp.178-193.
- Gaie, J.B.R. (2005) "Social Responsibility in Corporations and Business Ethics: The Role of Moral Theory and Botho" *BIAC Journal* **2 (2005:1)**, pp.41-65.
- (2007) "The Setswana Concept of Botho: Unpacking the Metaphysical and Moral Aspects" in Gaie, J.B.R. and Mmolai, S.K. (eds.) *The Concept of Botho and HIV/AIDS in Botswana*. Eldoret: Zapf Chancery, pp. 30-44.
- Gewirth, A. (2000) "The Justificatory Argument for Human Rights" in Sterba, J.P. (ed.) *Ethics. Classical Western Texts in Feminist and Multicultural Perspectives*. New York & Oxford; Oxford University Press pp.489-494.
- Hart, H. L. A. (1978). *The Concept of Law*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Lal, D. (2004) *In Praise of Empires. Globalization and Order*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Molefe, D. Pansiri, O and Weeks, S. (2007) "Globalisation And Education" in Mmegi Wednesday 3 January Vol.24 No.1
- Moshoeshe II (2000) "Harmony with Nature and Indigenous African Culture" in Sterba, J. P. *Ethics. Classical Western Texts in Feminist and Multicultural Perspectives*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. Pp.527-533.
- Payne, A.. (2005) *The Global Politics of Unequal Development*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Prasad, E.S., Rogoff, K., Wei, S-J, Kose, M.A., (2003) *Effects of Financial Globalization On Developing Countries: Some Empirical Evidence*. Washington D.C.: International Monetary Fund.
- People to People Forum@yahoogroups.com on behalf of enawgaw mehari “WHO Proposes Global Agenda on Transplantation. New World Observatory Launched with Spain.” News Release WHO/12 30 March 2007 (email received 31/3/07)
- Price, J.A. (2000) *Philosophy Through the Ages*. London & Stanford: Wadsworth Thomson Learning.
- Ramose, B.M. (2002) *African Philosophy Through Ubuntu*. Harare: Mond Books Publishers.
- Rawls, John. (1971) *A Theory of Justice*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,
- Simon, R. (2001) “Preferential Hiring: A Reply to Judith Jarvis Thomson” in Boylan, M. (ed.) *Business Ethics*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Pp. 253-255.
- Thomson, J.J. (2001) “Preferential Hiring” in Boylan, M. (ed.) *Business Ethics*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall. Pp. 247-252.
- Went, R.G. (2000) *Globalization. Neoliberal Challenge, Radical Responses*. Translated by Peter Drucker. London & Stirling Virginia: Pluto Press.
- ZENIT.Org. “Benedict XIV Warns of Syncretism. Dialogue Doesn’t Imply All Religions are Same, He Says” Vatican City March 30 2007